



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/763,882

01/23/2004

Taku Kodama

6453P029

6013

8791

7590

04/01/2009

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

LEE, JOHN W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/01/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/763,882	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KODAMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JOHN Wahnkyo LEE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-16, 18-19, 21-24, 26-27, 29-32, 34-35 and 37-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17, 20, 25, 28, 33, 36, 42 and 43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 23 January 2009 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 23 December 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as follows:

#### **I. Claims 25-26, 28-30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The examiner acknowledges that the applicant tried to overcome the rejection of 35 U.S.C. § 101 by amending the claims by adding a "control unit." The rejection will be withdrawn.

#### **II. Claims 17-18, 20, 25-26, 28-30, 32-34, 36 and 42-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

The specification do support "different compression method", "the components of the text region", "the drawing region", "the photograph region", "the background region", "encoded at different quantization ratios," separately, in paragraph [0052]. However, the

Art Unit: 2624

claims encompass these features as a whole, which is not supported by the specification. So, the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph cannot be withdrawn.

III. Claims 17-18, 20, 25-26, 28-30, 32-34, 36 and 42-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The examiner disagrees with the applicant. In the claims, the segmenting unit segments at least one of a text region, a drawing region, a photograph region and a background region, which means the segmenting unit may segment only one region at the minimum. Now, if you look at the encoding unit, the encoding unit uses all the regions. The examiner believes the regions segmented in the segmenting unit and the regions used in the encoding unit have to be the same ones, but if only one region is segmented, then the regions segmented by the segmenting unit and the encoding unit can be different. Of course, if the claim limitations were not sequential steps, it might not have a problem. However, the claims are written to be a sequential steps starting from the first claim limitation to the last one. So, the claims lack of antecedent basis, and the rejections cannot be withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17, 20, 25, 28, 33, 36 and 42-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 2624

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 17, 20, 25, 28, 33, 36 and 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The reason was discussed above.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 17, 20, 25, 28, 33, 36 and 42-43 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The reason is discussed above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 17, 20, 25, 28, 33, 36 and 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (US 2001/0028748) in view of Navon et al. (US 7,085,422).

Regarding claim 17, Sato discloses an image processing apparatus (Fig. 1A-1C, 7, 17A, and 17D; abstract), comprising: a segmenting unit to segment an image into regions (Fig. 1B-2, 7-2, and 17A-2; paragraph [0170], “subbands” and “wavelet transform”); a generating unit to make the one or more regions segmented by the segmenting unit into components (paragraph [0171], “regions of a predetermined unit”); an encoding unit to encode the components made by the generating unit (paragraph [0171], “regions of a predetermined unit”) into code data using a compression method (Fig. 1B-4, 7-4, 17A-4; paragraphs [0220]-[0225], “entropy encoding section” and “bit plane”), wherein the encoding unit divides the image into a plurality of tiles (Figs. 15A and 15B, “LL”, “HL2”, “LH2”, “HH2”, “HL2”, “HL1”, “LH1” and “HH1”; paragraph [0297], “subbands”) and hierarchically encodes the respective tiles into code data (Figs. 15A and 15B; paragraph [0004], “hierarchical encoding scheme”; paragraph [0299], “the codes of each block are arranged from the upper bit plane to the lower bit plane”); and a combining unit to combine the code data encoded by the encoded unit into a codestream (Fig. 1A-11, 3A-3E, 7-11, 17A-11; paragraphs [0220]-[0223], “code sequence construction section” and “code sequence”). However, Sato does not disclose all the claim limitations. Instead of Sato, Navon discloses segmenting at least one of a text region, a drawing region, a photograph region, and a background region (col. 4, lines 22-23, “foreground may comprise text and graphics”; Fig. 3; col. 4, lines 27-31, “image is separated in foreground and background.”) and using different compression methods (“compressing the foreground and the background separately, typically with the foreground stored with a higher quality compression method than the background

Art Unit: 2624

(col. 3, lines 46-50). The foreground may be compressed with an almost non-lossy compression method, and the background may be compressed with a high lossy compression method (abstract; col. 3, lines 50-53”), the components of the text region, the drawing region, the photograph region, and the background region (col. 4, lines 22-23, “foreground may comprise text and graphics”; Fig. 3; col. 4, lines 27-31, “image is separated in foreground and background.”) encoded at different quantization ratios (col. 3, lines 54-65, “foreground ... coarse quantizers ... background ... fine quantizers ...”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Navon’s invention in Sato’s invention to provide an improved image separation and compression tool as suggested by Navon (col. 1, lines 34-35).

Regarding claim 20, Sato further discloses an image processing apparatus as claimed in claim 21, further comprising: a storing unit to store the codestream combined by the combining unit (Fig. 7-10; paragraph [0261], “code sequence storage section”); a decoding unit to decode the codestream stored in the storing unit into an image (Figs. 1C and 7, “DEC”; claim 21); and an image forming unit to form the image decoded by the decoding unit (Figs. 7-8 and 7-12, “image construction section” and “image output section”).

Regarding claim 25, claim 25 is analogous and corresponds to claim 17. See rejection of claim 17 for further explanation.

Regarding claim 28, claim 28 is analogous and corresponds to claim 20. See rejection of claim 20 for further explanation.

Regarding claim 33, Sato further discloses that the invention is implemented when the program codes read out from the storage medium having a CPU for the performing the functions (paragraph [0311]). Moreover, claim 33 is analogous and corresponds to claim 17. See rejection of claim 17 for further explanation.

Regarding claim 36, Sato discloses that the invention is implemented when the program codes read out from the storage medium having a CPU for the performing the functions (paragraph [0311]). Moreover, claim 36 is analogous and corresponds to claim 20. See rejection of claim 20 for further explanation.

Regarding claim 42, Sato further discloses a charge unit to subject a region in the one or more regions of data to charge (Fig. 1A-13; paragraph [0212], "image quality setting section").

Regarding claim 43, Sato further discloses a converting unit to convert data formats of the text region and the drawing region into binary data and to convert a data format of the photograph region into multi-level data (Fig. 1B-3, 7-3, 17A-3; paragraphs [0218] and [0219], "quantization section").

### ***Conclusion***

10. No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN Wahnkyo LEE whose telephone number is (571)272-9554. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (Alt.) 7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..



Art Unit: 2624

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Samir Ahmed can be reached on (571) 272-7413. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John Wahnkyo Lee/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/Samir A. Ahmed/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624